REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 11-20 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1, 11, and 17 are amended herein. Support for the amendments may be found in the claims is filed originally, in Fig. 10, and at page 14, lines 10 and 11 and page 15, lines 8-15 of the specification. Further reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Interview Summary

The Applicants submit the following summary of the Office interview that took place August 22, 2007 between the undersigned representative of the Applicants and the Examiner.

Office Conference:

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the many courtesies extended to the undersigned representative of the Applicants during the Office interview that took place August 22, 2007.

Among the issues discussed during that interview were the patentability of the claims over the cited references, and the above-effected amendments to claims 1, 11, and 17.

As discussed during the interview, one difference between the subject invention and US Patent No. 6,128,641 to Fleck et al., might reside in the ability of the subject invention to return to any previously saved context, as described at page 14, lines 10 and 11 of the specification.

Fleck, in contrast to the claimed invention, while alluding to an ability to save the context of a current task and switch to another task at column 2, lines 18-31, never actually describes any hardware to support such a switching function. The description of Fleck, rather, ends with a description of restoring a context save area by reading from the CSA at the front of the previous contacts list, at column 7, lines 11-14. Nor does Fleck describe an ability to switch to any task beyond the immediately previous task at all.

The above-effected amendment, based on the discussion during the interview, adds the functions of the CPSA manager described at page 15, lines 8-15 to the method claim 1, and adds hardware such as the context pointer register and the CPSA manager shown in Fig. 10 to the apparatus claims 11 and 17. Since claims 1, 11, and 17 have been amended as discussed during the interview, claims 1-9 and 11-20 are believed to be allowable over the cited references. Reconsideration is thus requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 1-8, 11-17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by

Fleck et al., US 6,128,641 (hereinafter "Fleck"). The rejection is traversed to the extent it might apply to the claims as amended. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The fourth clause of claim 1 recites:

The task switching function selecting the second return address or the third return address from the register.

Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "the task switching function selecting the second return address or the third return address from the register," as discussed during the above-mentioned interview.

The fifth clause of claim 1 recites:

The task switching function executing a return operation to the data processing task corresponding to the selected return address.

Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "the task switching function executing a return operation to the data processing task corresponding to the selected return address," as also discussed during the above-mentioned interview. Claim 1 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 2-8 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-8 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 11-16:

The fourth clause of claim 11 recites:

A memory management apparatus coupled to said input and said memory, and responsive to said instruction information indicating a return instruction for moving said return address from said first storage location or said second storage location to a register of the data processor.

Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "a memory management apparatus coupled to said input and said memory, and responsive to said instruction information indicating a return instruction for moving said return address from said first storage location or said second storage location to a register of the data processor," as discussed during the above-mentioned interview.

The fifth clause of claim 11 recites:

Wherein said data processor executes a return operation to the task corresponding to the return address stored in the register of the data processor.

Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "wherein said data processor executes a return

7

operation to the task corresponding to the return address stored in the register of the data processor," as also discussed during the above-mentioned interview. Claim 11 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 12-16 depend from claim 11 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 12-16 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12-16 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 17:

The fourth clause of claim 17 recites:

A memory management apparatus coupled to said input and said memory, and responsive to said instruction information indicating a return instruction for moving said return address from said first storage location or said second storage location to a register of the data processing apparatus.

Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "a memory management apparatus coupled to said input and said memory, and responsive to said instruction information indicating a return instruction for moving said return address from said first storage location or said second storage location to a register of the data processing apparatus," as discussed during the above-mentioned interview.

The fifth clause of claim 17 recites:

The task switcher switching from execution of the first task to execution of the task corresponding to the return address stored in the register of the data processing apparatus.

Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "the task switcher switching from execution of the first task to execution of the task corresponding to the return address stored in the register of the data processing apparatus," as also discussed during the above-mentioned interview. Claim 17 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 is earnestly solicited.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fleck. Claim 18 depends from claim 17 and adds further distinguishing elements. Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "a memory management apparatus coupled to said input and said memory, and responsive to said instruction information indicating a return instruction for moving said return address from said first storage location or said second storage location to a register of the data processing apparatus," or "a memory management apparatus coupled to said input

8

and said memory, and responsive to said instruction information indicating a return instruction for moving said return address from said first storage location or said second storage location to a register of the data processing apparatus," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 17. Claim 18 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 9 and 20:

Claims 9 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fleck in view of "Applicant's Admitted Prior Art." Claims 9 and 20 depend from claims 1 and 17, respectively and add further distinguishing elements. Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "the task switching function selecting the second return address or the third return address from the register," or "the task switching function executing a return operation to the data processing task corresponding to the selected return address," as discussed above with respect to the rejections of claim 1. Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "a memory management apparatus coupled to said input and said memory, and responsive to said instruction information indicating a return instruction for moving said return address from said first storage location or said second storage location to a register of the data processing apparatus," or "a memory management apparatus coupled to said input and said memory, and responsive to said instruction information indicating a return instruction for moving said return address from said first storage location or said second storage location to a register of the data processing apparatus," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 17. The parts of the Application labeled "Prior Art" do not either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of Fleck with respect to claims 9 and 20. Claims 9 and 20 are thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 and 20 is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion:

Claims 1-9, and 11-20 are submitted to be allowable over the cited references. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 22OCO7

By: _____

Thomas E. McKiernan
Registration No. 37,899

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501